



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

9  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/815,878	03/22/2001	Karapet Ablabutyan	17793.00600	7381
36614	7590	05/24/2004	EXAMINER	
MANATT PHELPS AND PHILLIPS			FOX, CHARLES A	
ROBERT D. BECKER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1001 PAGE MILL ROAD, BUILDING 2				
PALO ALTO, CA 94304			3652	

DATE MAILED: 05/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/815,878	ABLABUTYAN, KARAPET
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Charles A. Fox	3652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 February 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
      1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
      3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)              |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.  |

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8,10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Lassanske. In regards to claims 1-5,7,8,10-12 and 14-17 the prior art (of figure 1) teaches a lift device comprising:

a movable platform adapted to move from a lower position, a upper position and a stowed position;

said platform is connected to a vehicle via an arm mechanism with a parallelogram structure;

wherein said platform is in a substantially horizontal orientation in the lower and upper positions and a substantially vertical orientation in the stowed position;

wherein said platform speed is reduced when placed or taken from the stowed position and is faster I the lower and upper positions;

wherein said platform is a wheelchair lift.

The prior art does not teach a hydraulic drive motor with an electric control circuit to control the speed of the lift by varying the power to the drive motor. Lassanske US 4,175,632 teaches a control circuit for a direct current motor (15) for driving a hydraulic pump (55) to limit the output of the pump, wherein said control circuit comprises a

variable resistive circuit in series with a power supply that controls the current to said drive motor.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention to provide the lifting device taught by the admitted prior art with the control circuit taught by Lassanske in order to selectively control the speed of the hydraulic pump thereby allowing the device to operate at varying speeds as needed for safety reasons, but without resorting to complex switching devices.

In regards to claim 13 the admitted prior art teaches using a solenoid to move the lift from a stowed position as well as causing the lift to move up or down vertically.

In regards to claim 18 Lassanske further teaches the control circuit for the motor as comprising:

a first switch (18) having a first terminal coupled to a power source (17) and a second terminal connected to a D.C. motor;

a second switch (19) having a first terminal connected to said power supply and a resistor coupled to a second terminal;

said resistor having a terminal connected to said motor.

In regards to claim 6 the admitted prior art (figure 6) teaches a lift device for vertically moving a vehicle, said lift having a platform for supporting said vehicle. The prior art does not teach a hydraulic drive motor with an electric control circuit to control the speed of the lift by varying the power to the drive motor. Lassanske US 4,175,632 teaches a control circuit for a direct current motor (15) for driving a hydraulic pump (55)

to limit the output of the pump, wherein said control circuit comprises a variable resistive circuit.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention to provide the lifting device taught by the prior art with the control circuit taught by Lassanske in order to selectively control the speed of the hydraulic pump thereby allowing the device to operate at varying speeds as needed for safety reasons, but without resorting to complex switching devices.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art and Lassanske as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Neagu. The admitted prior art and Lassanske teach the limitations of claim 7 as above, they do not teach the lift device as being a tailgate type lift. Neagu US 4,836,736 teaches a tailgate type lift (10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention that the device as taught by Saucier et al. in view of Antoun could be modified to fit work on the tailgate of a vehicle as taught by Neagu in order to allow the device to load and unload a truck in a safe and efficient manner.

Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Lassanske as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Daggett et al. The admitted prior art in view of Lassanske teach the limitations of claim 18 as above, they do not teach additional switches being added to the control circuit to further alter the speed of the DC motor. Daggett et al. US 5,144,211 teaches a drive motor control circuit comprising:

a first (61-1) and a second (61-3) switch for controlling the power thereto ;

a third (61-2) and a forth (61-4) switch connected to the terminal end of said first and second switches;

wherein activation of said third and forth switches causes varying currents through said motor. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention to provide the control circuit taught by the admitted prior art in view of Lassanske with additional switches in order to allow the speed of the motor to be controlled under real time operational conditions.

***Response to Amendment***

The amendment to the claims filed on February 9, 2004 have been entered into the record.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed February 9, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In regards to the use of the Lassanske reference in the rejections of claims 1,6 and 7, the examiner does not agree with the applicants reading of the reference. Referring to column 3 lines 20-42 in the Lassanske reference it is explicitly stated that a D.C. with a variable input is used as a secondary means of speed control of the vehicle. The examiner is not relying on the hydraulic system taught by Lassanske, but rather the electrical system taught by Lassanske. As such the reference is a clear teaching that the type of electrical circuit as claimed in the instant application can be used to change the speed of a hydraulically activated system. It is further noted that Lassanske does not supply a constant voltage to the motor as asserted by the applicant as is evident per the above cited passage.

In regards to the arguments against the rejections of claim 9 the applicant gives no specifics to respond to. The examiner believes that all limitations of the claims have been met as presented in the rejection of that claim above. The rejections stand as before.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles A. Fox whose telephone number is 703-605-4294. The examiner can normally be reached between 7:00-5:00 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen D. Lillis can be reached at 703-308-3248. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3652

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CAF

CAF

5/15/04



5/17/04

DEAN J. KRAMER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER